

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/017,689	KAKIVAYA ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
DEBBIE M. LE	2168	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** *pending*

(1) DEBBIE M. LE.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Swope.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 October 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*current rejection of record*

Claims discussed:

1,3,8,8,9,13

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/DEBBIE M LE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 8 raises an potential 35 USC 101 directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claim recites a "system", but it fails to claim a hardware component. Claims 1, 8 and 21 have also been amended. Thus, Applicant agreed with the Examiner's suggestion as directly results in the Examiner's Amendment.